

Appln. No. 10/638,157
Amendment dated December 21, 2004
Reply to Office Action mailed September 27, 2004

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4-6, and 11-17 remain in this application. Claims 2 and 3 have been cancelled. Claims 7-10, and 18-20 have been withdrawn.

The Examiner's rejections will be considered in the order of their occurrence in the Office Action.

Paragraph 2 of the Office Action

The applicant hereby affirms the provisional election of species 1, claims 1-6 and 11-13. As discussed below, claims 14-17 are believed to be rejoined as being dependent upon an allowable generic claim (claim 11).

Paragraph 3 of the Office Action

Claims 2, 3 and 11-13 have been objected to for the informalities noted in the Office Action.

Claims 1 (incorporating the limitations of claims 2 and 3 as originally filed) and 11 have been amended in a manner believed to clarify any informalities in the language.

Withdrawal of the objection to claims 2, 3 and 11-13 is therefore respectfully requested.

Paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Office Action

Claims 1, 2 and 4-6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kane et al.

Claim 1, particularly as amended, incorporates the as-filed limitations of claim 3, including the limitations of intervening claim 2. Therefore in accordance with paragraph 6 of the office action, claim 1, especially as amended is believed to be allowable. Claims 4-6 are dependent upon amended claim 1, and by virtue of their dependence are also believed to be allowable.

Appn. No. 10/638,157
Amendment dated December 21, 2004
Reply to Office Action mailed September 27, 2004

Withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection of claims 1, 2 and 4-6 is therefore respectfully requested.

Paragraph 6 of the Office Action

Paragraph 6 of the Office Action states that claim 3 would be allowable if written into independent form with the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The above amendment incorporates the limitations of claims 2 and 3 (in their as-filed form) into the recitation of claim 1, and therefore claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 4-6, by virtue of their dependency from amended claim 1, are also submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Paragraph 7 of the Office Action

Paragraph 7 of the Office Action states that claims 11-13 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the objections presented in paragraph 3 of the office action. The above amendment has addressed the specific objections presented, specifically changing "a intermediate" to "an intermediate" and "aids" to "aiding. Therefore claim 11 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 12 and 13 are dependent upon claim 11 and by virtue of that dependence are also believed to be allowable.

Previously withdrawn claims 14-17 are believed to be rejoined as being dependent upon generic claim 11, and are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Appln. No. 10/638,157
Amendment dated December 21, 2004
Reply to Office Action mailed September 27, 2004

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

LEONARD & PROEHL, Prof. L.L.C.

By Mark A. Ekse Date: 12/23/04
Mark A. Ekse (Reg. No. 50,130)
LEONARD & PROEHL, Prof. L.L.C.
Customer Number 40158
3500 South First Avenue Circle, Suite 250
Sioux Falls, SD 57105-5807
(605)339-2028 FAX (605)336-1931